



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CR
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,659	09/10/2003	Nathaniel Christopher Herwig	11388.00	3696
26884	7590	10/19/2005		EXAMINER
PAUL W. MARTIN NCR CORPORATION, LAW DEPT. 1700 S. PATTERSON BLVD. DAYTON, OH 45479-0001			LABAZE, EDWYN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/659,659	HERWIG ET AL.	
	Examiner EDWYN LABAZE	Art Unit 2876	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of amendments filed on 7/20/2005.
2. Claims 1-8 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Coutts et al. (U.S. 6,311,165).

Re claims 1 and 7: Coutts et al. discloses transaction processing systems, which includes a receipt printer 14, including a housing 11 (col.8, lines 60+; col.56, lines 45+); a bar code reader in the housing (col.4, lines 10+; col.27, lines 47+); and control circuitry [through the module hardware 9/30] in the housing for facilitating communication of receipt data between the printer 14 and a separately housed [herein described as server 3/16/26; as shown in figs. # 1-2, 4a] controlling computer and bar code data between the bar code reader and the separately housed controlling computer over a single cable 17 (col.8, lines 40+; col.11, lines 60+). Coutts et al. further discloses a universal serial bus hub/link [which also could be an RS-232 link, Firewire or Ethernet link; as shown in fig. # 4a, 8, 15, 26-31] for interconnecting the various peripheral devices within the housing and with the external peripheral devices (col.19, lines 60-67; col.27, lines 50+).

Re claim 5: Coutts et al. discloses an apparatus, wherein the bar code reader is located in a position in the housing 11 {as shown in fig. # 2} that does not interfere with operation of the printer 14 (col.8, lines 55+).

Re claim 6: Coutts et al. teaches an apparatus, wherein the control circuitry comprises a universal serial bus hub (col.19, lines 60-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coutts et al. (U.S. 6,311,165) in view Zhu et al. (U.S. 6,619,549).

The teachings of Coutts et al. have been discussed above.

Coutts et al. fails to teach an imaging scanner comprises of a charge coupled device or CCD, and a presentation scanner.

Zhu et al. discloses barcode symbol reading device having intelligent data communication interface to a host system, which includes a presentation scanner (col.4, lines 5+; col.11, lines 1+); USB link (col.17, lines 1-67), and a CCD scanner (col.23, lines 30+; col.29, lines 10+).

In view of Zhu et al.'s teachings, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ into the teachings of Coutts et al. a

presentation scanner also known in the art as a hand-free/pass-through scanner so as to permit the barcodes to be presented to the scanner with a motion that is parallel to the window. Furthermore, such modification would be beneficial to the user by reducing stress and fatigue of holding to use the [wand] scanner, wherein the presentation scanner is fixedly connected to housing/device while bar coded objects are moved through the scanned field. Moreover, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Coutts et al., therefore an obvious expedient.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 7/20/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the references fail to teach a computer peripheral including the limitations as stated in claim 1 (see applicant's arguments; page 5, 3rd paragraph).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's remarks. The prior art of record, Coutts et al. does teach a housing {herein as an ATM/Ultra Thin Client architecture can be easily used across different environments, allowing common modules and components being sourced in higher volumes and at a reduced cost. Using the user interface, card reader and receipt printer from an ATM system combined, e.g., with a bar code scanner module, the same ATM system modules and control software with similar applications could provide a POS terminal, as illustrated in FIG. 24. The retail store network can provide the necessary environment for the download of software and for connecting to stock and pricing information} for containing two

normally separately housed peripheral for saving space at a checkout station/POS terminal (col.31, lines 1-19).

The examiner would also like to point out that fig. # of the claimed invention does not show two separately housed peripherals. In fact, bar code reader 30 and receipt printer 32 are both in a single housing 36 as disclosed in the specifications (page 3, lines 5+). Furthermore, Coutts et al. discloses means of controlling transaction computer over a single cable (see fig. # 15 of Coutts et al.)

Therefore, the prior art of record anticipates the limitations of the claimed invention and the examiner retains the rejections as set forth above.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Augustine (U.S. 6,550,683) discloses handheld portable device with multiple functions.

Gatto et al. (U.S. 6,710,895) teaches compact configurable scanning computer terminal.

Bartley et al. (US 2002/0175208) discloses network transaction and cash-accepting add-value station.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO


MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EDWYN LABAZE whose telephone number is (571) 272-2395. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

el
Edwyn Labaze
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2876
October 6, 2005



THIEN M. LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER